arXiv:hep-th/0604011v3 8 Apr 2007

Quantum mechanics from time scaling and random fluctuations at the "quick time scale"

Andrei Khrennikov*
International Center for Mathematical Modeling
in Physics and Cognitive Sciences,
University of Växjö, S-35195, Sweden
Email:Andrei.Khrennikov@msi.vxu.se

Abstract

We show that (in contrast to a rather common opinion) QM is not a complete theory. This is a statistical approximation of classical statistical mechanics on the *infinite dimensional phase space.* Such an approximation is based on the asymptotic expansion of classical statistical averages with respect to a small parameter κ. Therefore statistical predictions of QM are only approximative and a better precision of measurements would induce deviations of experimental averages from quantum mechanical ones. In this note we present a natural physical interpretation of κ as the time scaling parameter (between quantum and prequantum times).

1 Introduction

In [1] we showed that the conventional quantum formalism can be obtained as a statistical approximation of classical statistical mechanics on the *infinite dimensional phase space.* Such an approximation is based on the asymptotic expansion of classical statistical averages

---

*Supported in part by the EU Human Potential Programme, contact HPRN–CT–2002–00279 (Network on Quantum Probability and Applications) and Profile Math. Modelling in Physics and Cogn. Sc. of Växjö University.

with respect to a small parameter κ. By representing points of the phase space ("hidden variables") by classical vector fields, $\psi(x) = (q(x), p(x))$, we can interpret our prequantum theory as a field theory, *prequantum classical statistical field theory - PCSFT.*

We emphasize the basis of PCSFT is given by the model of "nonempty vacuum" inducing so called *vacuum fluctuations,* cf. SED, and different variants of stochastic QM and random field theory [2]–[11] (cf. also with "prespace" considered by B. Hiley [12] and in the probabilistic framework in [13]). The author was also strongly influenced by papers [14]-[18], and especially the recent review [19].

In the present paper we interpret the small parameter κ as the *time scaling parameter.* This gives the possibility to couple our model with studies in general relativity, string theory and cosmology on the structure of space-time on the Planckian scale.

To choose the small parameter of our model, κ, we should choose quantum and prequantum time scales. There are a few different possibilities and we shall use one of them. We choose the *atom time*-scale in QM and the *Planck time*-scale in the prequantum classical theory. At the atom scale we consider the “Hartree time”:

$$t_q = t_H = \frac{\hbar}{E_H},$$

where E_H is the Hartree energy. Under such a choice of time scales, our small parameter is given by

$$\kappa = \frac{t_P}{t_H} \approx 10^{-27}. \tag{1}$$

The choice of the atom time-scale is motivated by the fact that this is the characteristic time scale of atom physics, physics in modern laboratories. We can call this scale observational time scale. The choice of a prequantum time scale is an essentially more complicated problem. At the present time we are not able to observe directly prequantum fluctuations. Thus we do not know the characteristic scale of those fluctuations. We can only speculate. The choice of the Planck time-scale is just one of such speculations.

We show that QM can be interpreted as an approximative description of physical reality which is obtained through neglecting by time intervals $\Delta t \leq t_P$. We assume that such time intervals are negligibly small for some observer (so $\Delta t \approx 0$). Then contributions of such a magnitude into averages can be neglected. And, hence, there can be used the conventional quantum mechanical rules for computing of averages.

One of the main consequences of our approach for cosmology is that (in contrast to the very common opinion) the Planck time t_P is not at all the *"ultimate limit to our laws of physics"* (in the sense of laws of classical physics). A rather common idea that only the quantum description is possible at the Planck scale for time and space should be completed by the following thesis: "Yes, the quantum description is possible, but it should be considered not as an alternative to the classical one, but as an approximation."

The crucial point is that in our framework "classical" is not at all "usual classical" (i.e., classical statistical mechanics on the phase space $\Omega = \mathbf{R}^3 \times \mathbf{R}^3$), but "infinite dimensional classical". Thus at the Planck scale physical space is *fundamentally infinite dimensional.* In our approach the conventional mathematical model of physical space, namely $\mathbf{R}^3$, should be rejected. We proceed in the similar way as it was done in string theory, but, instead of finite dimensional models, e.g., $\mathbf{R}^{26}$, we should consider *infinite dimensional physical space.*

We hope that our approach may clarify the situation with constructing quantum gravity. It is well known that, in spite of a partial success, one could not say that the "project quantum gravity" was completely successful. Our approach says that such a rather negative result might be expected. By our ideology "quantum" $\sim$ "approximative". But, if general relativity is really a complete (classical) physical theory, quantum general relativity has no meaning. Even if general relativity is not complete theory and a finer description is possible, it is more natural to assume that such a pre general relativity would be a new classical theory.

Mathematically our model is based on *the Brownian motion in the space of classical fields.* The averaging with respect to a quantum state given by the von Neumann density operator D can be represented as an approximation of averaging with respect to the classical random field given by the Wiener process (with the covariance operator D) taking values in the space of classical fields.[1] One can imagine quantum randomness as purely classical randomness which is similar to randomness of a Brownian particle. The only difference is that, instead of motion of a particle colliding with molecules, we consider motion of a classical field colliding with random field media (fluctuations of the background field). The crucial point is that such a Brownian motion of classical fields is performed on a *very quick time scale* which is essentially finer than time scales approachable in modern physics. We are not able to observe this random motion directly (as we can do for the conventional Brownian motion of particles). Nevertheless, one could expect that sooner or later such a fine time scale would be approached and e.g. electron would be seen as a fluctuating classical field (interacting with the background field). Our model supports expectations that it would be possible to go beyond QM.

---

[1] The ordinary Wiener process is a map $(t, \omega) \to w(t, \omega) \in \mathbf{R}^3$, where t and ω are time and chance parameters, respectively. We consider the field-valued Wiener process which is a map $(t, \omega) \to w(t, \omega) \in L_2(\mathbf{R}^3)$. For each (t, ω), the classical field $\psi = w(t, \omega)$ belongs to the L_2-space: $\psi = \psi(t, \omega, x)$ is a random field.

We point out to the following terminological problem. Typically the Planck scale is regarded as quantum scale. There are numerous speculations that at this scale there is no more place for classical physics and the quantum description of phenomena is the only possible one. PCSFT does not support such views. From the point of view of PCSFT QM is an approximative theory. Therefore it is natural to define quantum scale as the scale of applicability of QM. In our approach this is the scale of quantum systems: atoms, electrons, mesons, neutrino,... This scale is far from the Planck scale. Thus the Planck scale has nothing to do with really quantum scale. Moreover, PCSFT does support the viewpoint that the Planck scale might be appropriative for description of *prequantum fluctuations.* Therefore we choosen this scale as a *prequantum scale.* Hence, in short:

In this paper the atom scale is called qauntum, the Planck scale is called prequantum.

2 On the properties of classical→quantum correspondence

We define *"classical statistical models"* in the following way, see [1] for more detail (and even philosophic considerations): a) physical states ω are represented by points of some set Ω (state space); b) physical variables are represented by functions $f : \Omega \to \mathbf{R}$ belonging to some functional space $V(\Omega)$; c) statistical states are represented by probability measures on Ω belonging to some class $S(\Omega)$; d) the average of a physical variable (which is represented by a function $f \in V(\Omega)$) with respect to a statistical state (which is represented by a probability measure $\rho \in S(\Omega)$) is given by

$$< f >_\rho \equiv \int_\Omega f(\psi) d\rho(\psi). \tag{2}$$

A *classical statistical model* is a pair $M = (S, V)$.[2]

The conventional quantum statistical model with the complex Hilbert state space Ω_c is described in the following way: a) physical observables are represented by operators $A : \Omega_c \to \Omega_c$ belonging to the class of continuous self-adjoint operators $\mathcal{L}_s \equiv \mathcal{L}_s(\Omega_c)$; b) statistical states are represented by von Neumann density operators (the class of such operators is denoted by $\mathcal{D} \equiv \mathcal{D}(\Omega_c)$); d) the average of a physical observable (which is represented by the operator $A \in \mathcal{L}_s(\Omega_c)$) with respect to a statistical state (which is represented by the density operator $D \in \mathcal{D}(\Omega_c)$) is given by von Neumann's formula:

$$< A >_D \equiv \text{Tr DA} \tag{3}$$

The *quantum statistical model* is the pair $N_{\text{quant}} = (\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{L}_s)$.

We are looking for a classical statistical model $M = (S, V)$ which will provide *"dequantization" of the quantum model* $N_{\text{quant}} = (\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{L}_s)$. By dequantization we understand constructing of a classical statistical model such that averages given by this model can be approximated by quantum averages. Approximation is based on the asymptotic expansion of classical averages with respect to a small parameter. The main term of this expansion coincides with the corresponding quantum average.

One should not mix dequantization with so called *deformation quantization,* see e.g. [20]. The fundamental principle of deformation quantization is so called *correspondence principle.* By this principle if one considers the Planck constant h as a small parameter then in the $h \to 0$ quantum mechanics is transformed into classical mechanics on the finite-dimensional phase space – classical mechanics of particles. In this framework quantum mechanics is considered as a theory which is more general ("precise") than classical mechanics of particles. Only by neglecting by actions of the Planck magnitude one can apply the classical description. If actions of the Planck magnitude are taken into account then the classical mechanical description of phenomena is not more valid. Classical predictions (for statistics of particles) can deviate from quantum predictions. The latter are considered as totally precise. Such deviations can be tested experimentally.

---

[2] We recall that classical statistical mechanics on the phase space $\Omega_{2n} = \mathbf{R}^n \times \mathbf{R}^n$ gives an example of a classical statistical model. But we shall not be interested in this example in our further considerations. We shall develop a classical statistical model with *an infinite-dimensional phase-space.*

Dequantization should not be considered as the inverse operation to deformation quantization. One point is that a classical prequantum model (which we will construct) does not coincide with the conventional classical statistical mechanics on the finite dimensional phase space. Our prequantum model is not classical statistical mechanics of particles, but it is statistical mechanics of classical fields. Thus phase space has the infinite dimension. Therefore deformation quantization and dequantization simply operate on totally different phase spaces.

Another point (which is the crucial one) is that in the dequantization framework not quantum mechanics, but prequantum classical statistical model provides a better description of physical phenomena. The quantum description is only an approximative description. It can be applied only if one neglects by some small parameter (which is time scale parameter κ in this paper). By taking into account this parameter one obtains a better description of physical phenomena. Predictions of quantum mechanics should be violated. Those violations might be tested experimentally.

We remark that the procedure of dequantization does not contradict to the procedure of deformation quantization.[3] These are two different, but consistent limiting procedures. We have the following scale of statistical descriptions of physical reality:

$$\text{Classical field theory} \to \text{Quantum mechanics} \tag{4}$$

$$\to \text{Mechanics of classical particles} \tag{5}$$

In fact, all "NO-GO" theorems (e.g., von Neumann, Kochen-Specker, Bell,...) can be interpreted as theorems about impossibility of various dequantization procedures. Therefore we should define the procedure of dequantization in such a way that there will be no contradiction with known "NO-GO" theorems, but our dequantization procedure still will be natural from the physical viewpoint. We define (asymptotic) dequantization as a family $M^\kappa = (S^\kappa, V)$ of classical statistical models depending on small parameter $\kappa \geq 0$. There should exist maps $T : S^\kappa \to \mathcal{D}$ and $T : V \to \mathcal{L}_s$ such that: a) both maps are *surjections*

---

[3] Although we do not want to critisize the correspondence principle, we should remark that this principle (which was elaborated by N. Bohr) has never beeen totally justified.

(so all quantum states and observables can be represented as images of classical statistical states and variables, respectively); b) the map $T : V \to \mathcal{L}_s$ is $\mathbf{R}$-linear (we recall that we consider real-valued classical physical variables); c) the map $T : S \to \mathcal{D}$ is injection (there is one-to one correspondence between classical and quantum statistical states); d) classical and quantum averages are coupled through the following asymptotic equality:

$$< f >_\rho = \kappa < T(f) >_{T(\rho)} + O(\kappa^2), \;\; \kappa \to 0 \tag{6}$$

(here $< T(f) >_{T(\rho)}$ is the quantum average); so:

$$\int_\Omega f(\psi) d\rho(\psi) = \kappa \; \mathrm{Tr} \; \mathrm{DA} + \mathrm{O}(\kappa^2), \;\; \mathrm{A} = \mathrm{T(f)}, \mathrm{D} = \mathrm{T}(\rho). \tag{7}$$

This equality can be interpreted in the following way. Let $f(\psi)$ be a classical physical variable (describing properties of microsystems - classical fields having very small magnitude κ). We define its *amplification* by:

$$f_\kappa(\psi) = \frac{1}{\kappa} f(\psi) \tag{8}$$

(so any micro effect is amplified in $\frac{1}{\kappa}$-times). Since κ gives *intensity of vacuum fluctuations,* the quantity f_κ can be interpreted as relative intensity of f with respect to vacuum fluctuations. For such a relative intensity, we have:

$$< f_\kappa >_\rho = < T(f) >_{T(\rho)} + O(\kappa), \;\; \kappa \to 0. \tag{9}$$

Hence: *QM is a mathematical formalism describing a statistical approximation of relative intensities of classical field variables with respect to vacuum fluctuations.* [4]

---

[4] We recall that in the von Neumann "NO-GO" theorem there was assumed that the correspondence T between classical variables and quantum observables is *one-to-one.* Thus our dequantization violates this von Neumann condition. Therefore the von Neumann theorem could not be applied to PCSFT. On the other hand, the map $T : V \to \mathcal{L}_s$ (given by (15)) is $\mathbf{R}$-linear as it was postulated by J. von Neumann (thus, e.g., $T(f_1 + f_2) = T(f_1) + T(f_2)$ even in the case of noncommuting operators $T(f_1)$ and $T(f_2)$). We recall that this assumption was criticized by many authors, in particular, by J. Bell. The crucial difference with dequantizations considered in known "NO-GO" theorems is that in our case *classical and quantum averages are equal only asymptotically.* We also remark that a classical variable f and the corresponding quantum observable $A = T(f)$ can have *different ranges of values.* In particular, the latter possibility blocks application of Bell's theorem to PCSFT.

3 Prequantum classical statistical field theory

We choose the phase space $\Omega = Q \times P$, where $Q = P = H$ and H is the infinite-dimensional real (separable) Hilbert space. We consider Ω as the real Hilbert space with the scalar product $(\psi_1, \psi_2) = (q_1, q_2) + (p_1, p_2)$. We denote by J the symplectic operator on $\Omega : J = \left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{array} \right)$. Let us consider the class $\mathcal{L}_{\rm symp}(\Omega)$ of bounded $\mathbf{R}$-linear operators $A : \Omega \to \Omega$ which commute with the symplectic operator: A J= J A . This is a subalgebra of the algebra of bounded linear operators $\mathcal{L}(\Omega)$. We also consider the space of $\mathcal{L}_{\rm symp,s}(\Omega)$ consisting of self-adjoint operators.

By using the operator J we can introduce on the phase space Ω the complex structure. Here J is realized as $-i$. We denote Ω endowed with this complex structure by $\Omega_c : \Omega_c \equiv Q \oplus iP$. We shall use it later. At the moment consider Ω as a real linear space and consider its complexification $\Omega^{\mathbf{C}} = \Omega \oplus i\Omega$.

Let us consider the functional space $\mathcal{V}_{\rm symp}(\Omega)$ consisting of functions $f : \Omega \to \mathbf{R}$ such that: a) the state of vacuum is preserved : $f(0) = 0$; b) f is J-invariant: $f(J\psi) = f(\psi)$; c) f can be extended to the analytic function $f : \Omega^{\mathbf{C}} \to \mathbf{C}$ having the exponential growth: $|f(\psi)| \leq c_f e^{r_f \|\psi\|}$ for some $c_f, r_f \geq 0$ and for all $\psi \in \Omega^{\mathbf{C}}$. [5]

The following trivial mathematical result plays the fundamental role in establishing classical → quantum correspondence: *Let f be a smooth J-invariant function. Then* $f''(0) \in \mathcal{L}_{\rm symp,s}(\Omega)$. In particular, a quadratic form is J-invariant iff it is determined by an operator belonging to $\mathcal{L}_{\rm symp,s}(\Omega)$.

We consider the space statistical states $S^{\kappa}_{G,{\rm symp}}(\Omega)$ consisting of measures ρ on Ω such that: a) ρ has zero mean value; b) it is a Gaussian measure; c) it is J-invariant; d) its dispersion has the magnitude κ. Thus these are J-invariant Gaussian measures such that

$$\int_\Omega \psi d\rho(\psi) = 0 \text{ and } \sigma^2(\rho) = \int_\Omega \|\psi\|^2 d\rho(\psi) = \kappa, \ \kappa \to 0.$$

Such measures describe small Gaussian fluctuations of the vacuum field. The following trivial mathematical result plays the fundamental role in establishing classical → quantum correspondence: *Let a measure ρ be J-invariant. Then its covariation operator $B = \mathrm{cov}\ \rho \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{symp,s}}(\Omega)$.* Here $(By_1, y_2) = \int (y_1, \psi)(y_2, \psi) d\rho(\psi)$.

---

[5] We remark that the possibility to extend a function f analytically onto $\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}$ and the exponential estimate on $\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}$ plays the important role in the asymptotic expansion of Gaussian integrals. To get a mathematically rigor formulation, conditions in [1] should be reformulated in the similar way.

We now consider the complex realization Ω_c of the phase space and the corresponding complex scalar product $< \cdot, \cdot >$. We remark that the class of operators $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{symp}}(\Omega)$ is mapped onto the class of $\mathbf{C}$-linear operators $\mathcal{L}(\Omega_c)$. We also remark that, for any $A \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{symp,s}}(\Omega)$, real and complex quadratic forms coincide: $(A\psi, \psi) =< A\psi, \psi >$. We also define for any measure its complex covariation operator $B^c = \mathrm{cov}^{\mathrm{c}} \rho$ by $< B^c y_1, y_2 >= \int < y_1, \psi >< \psi, y_2 > d\rho(\psi)$. We remark that for a J-invariant measure ρ its complex and real covariation operators are related as $B^c = 2B$. As a consequence, we obtain that any J-invariant Gaussian measure is uniquely determined by its complex covariation operator. As in the real case [1], we can prove that for any operator $A \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{symp,s}}(\Omega) : \int_\Omega < A\psi, \psi > d\rho(\psi) = \mathrm{Tr}\ \mathrm{cov}^{\mathrm{c}} \rho\ \mathrm{A}$. We pay attention that the trace is considered with respect to the complex inner product.

We consider now the one parameter family of classical statistical models:

$$M^\kappa = (S^\kappa_{G,\mathrm{symp}}(\Omega), \mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{symp}}(\Omega)),\ \kappa \geq 0, \tag{10}$$

By making in the Gaussian infinite-dimensional integral the change of variables (field scaling):

$$\psi = \sqrt{\kappa} \Psi, \tag{11}$$

we obtain the following result:

Lemma 1. *Let $f \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{symp}}(\Omega)$ and let $\rho \in S^\kappa_{G,\mathrm{symp}}(\Omega)$. Then the following asymptotic equality holds:*

$$< f >_\rho = \frac{\kappa}{2}\ \mathrm{Tr}\ \mathrm{D^c}\ \mathrm{f}''(0) + \mathrm{O}(\kappa^2),\ \kappa \to 0, \tag{12}$$

where the operator $D^c = \mathrm{cov}^{\mathrm{c}}\ \rho/\kappa$. Here

$$O(\kappa^2) = \kappa^2 R(\kappa, f, \rho), \tag{13}$$

where $|R(\kappa, f, \rho)| \leq c_f \int_\Omega e^{r_f \|\Psi\|} d\rho_{D^c}(\Psi)$.

Here ρ_{D^c} is the Gaussian measure with zero mean value and the complex covariation operator D^c.

We see that the classical average (computed in the model $M^\kappa = (S^\kappa_{G,\mathrm{symp}}(\Omega), \mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{symp}}(\Omega))$ by using the measure-theoretic approach) is coupled through (12) to the quantum average (computed in the model $N_{\mathrm{quant}} = (\mathcal{D}(\Omega_c),\ \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{s}}(\Omega_c))$ by the von Neumann trace-formula).

The equality (12) can be used as the motivation for defining the following classical → quantum map T from the classical statistical model $M^\kappa = (S^\kappa_{G,\mathrm{symp}}, \mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{symp}})$ onto the quantum statistical model $N_{\mathrm{quant}} = (\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{s}})$:

$$T : S^\kappa_{G,\mathrm{symp}}(\Omega) \to \mathcal{D}(\Omega_c),\ \ D^c = T(\rho) = \frac{\mathrm{cov}^{\mathrm{c}}\ \rho}{\kappa} \tag{14}$$

(the Gaussian measure ρ is represented by the density matrix D^c which is equal to the complex covariation operator of this measure normalized by κ);

$$T : \mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{symp}}(\Omega) \to \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{s}}(\Omega_c),\ \ A_{\mathrm{quant}} = T(f) = \frac{1}{2} f''(0). \tag{15}$$

Our previous considerations can be presented as

Theorem 1. *The one parametric family of classical statistical models $M^\kappa = (S^\kappa_{G,\mathrm{symp}}(\Omega), \mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{symp}}(\Omega))$ provides dequantization of the quantum model $N_{\mathrm{quant}} = (\mathcal{D}(\Omega_c),\ \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{s}}(\Omega_c))$ through the pair of maps (14) and (15). The classical and quantum averages are coupled by the asymptotic equality (12).*

4 Time-scaling for infinite-dimensional Wiener process

Let $w^D_s, s \geq 0$, be the Ω-valued Wiener process corresponding to the trace class (self-adjoint) operator $D \geq 0$ with $\mathrm{TrD} = 1$. We also assume that D is J-commuting. Thus

$$E < \phi, w^D_s >= 0, \phi \in \Omega, \tag{16}$$

$$E < \phi_1, w^D_s >< w^D_s, \phi_2 >= s < D\phi_1, \phi_2 >, \phi_1, \phi_2 \in \Omega. \tag{17}$$

Then we have:

$$\text{Prob. law } (w^D_{\kappa s} : s \geq 0) = \text{Prob. law } (\kappa^{1/2} w^D_s : s \geq 0) \tag{18}$$

for any $\kappa > 0$. We shall see that by (18) our $\kappa^{1/2}$-scaling of $\psi \in \Omega$ can be considered as the result of κ-scaling of time.

Our basic postulate is that *quantum formalism arises as the result of an approximation based on the time scaling*

Let us consider a *"prequantum time scale"* that is essentially finer[6] than the quantum time scale. We suppose that these two time scales can be coupled through a small scaling parameter $\kappa > 0$. Denote the prequantum and quantum times by symbols s and t respectively. We suppose that:

$$t = \kappa s \tag{19}$$

Here κ is a dimensionless parameter. It is assumed that

$$\kappa << 1 \tag{20}$$

Thus the unit interval $s = 1$ of the pre-quantum time corresponds to a small interval $t = \kappa$ of the quantum time. We can also say that the unit interval $t = 1$ of quantum time corresponds to a huge interval $s = \frac{1}{\kappa}$ of the prequantum time. Moreover, if $\kappa \to 0$, then $s = \frac{1}{\kappa} \to \infty$. Therefore at the prequantum time scale quantum processes have practically infinite duration.

Let us consider the time scaling (19) for the Wiener processes w_s^D. We set

$$W_t^D = w_{\kappa s}^D.$$

The formula (18) implies that, for any continuous function $f : \Omega \to \mathbf{R}$ (which is integrable with respect to any Gaussian measure on Ω), we have:

$$Ef(W_\kappa^D) = Ef(\kappa^{1/2} w_1^D). \tag{21}$$

This is nothing else than the basic "field-scaling" formula (11)! We interpret W_t^D as the Wiener process with respect to the quantum time t and w_s^D as the Wiener process with respect to the prequantum time s.

The tricky thing with the quantum formalism is that it does not give a possibility to find exactly the average $Ef(W_t^D)$ with respect to the "quantum Wiener process" W_t^D. The main problem is that the interval $t = \kappa$ is negligibly small (from the QM-viewpoint).

The quantum formalism provides only an approximation of the classical average $Ef(W_\kappa^D)$.

Moreover, to produce observable effects, the classical physical variable f should be amplified: $f \to f_\kappa \equiv \frac{1}{\kappa} f$.

---

[6] The meaning of "essentially" would be discussed later.

In such an approach to QM, we can proceed through expanding the right-hand side of (16) into series with respect to the scaling parameter $\kappa^{1/2}$. If we take $f \in \mathcal{V}_{\rm symp}(\Omega)$ then by using the probabilistic notations we can repeat considerations of section 3:

$$Ef_\kappa(W_\kappa^D) = Ef_\kappa(\kappa^{1/2} w_1^D) = \frac{1}{2} E(f''(0)w_1^D, w_1^D) + O(\kappa), \kappa \to 0. \quad (22)$$

Therefore, for nonquadratic maps $f : \Omega \to \mathbf{R}$, QM gives only an approximation $< f_\kappa >_D = {\rm TrDf}''(0)$ of the real average $Ef_\kappa(W_\kappa^D)$.

The difference between statistical predictions of QM and PCSFT is of the magnitude κ, where κ is the scaling parameter coupling the prequantum and quantum time scales, see (19). What is a magnitude of the time scaling factor κ?

Thus by taking into account Brownian fluctuations on the prequantum time scale we can say that prequantum statistical states are given by Wiener measures P_D on the space $C_0([0,\kappa])$, of trajectories $\psi : [0,\kappa] \to \Omega, \psi(0) = 0$. Denote this space of such Wiener measures by the symbol $S_{G,{\rm symp}}(C_0([0,\kappa]), \Omega)$ (we recall that $[D, J] = 0$).

This is the space of statistical states of our new prequantum classical statistical model. As the space of classical physical variables, we should choose some subspace of the space of continuous functionals $f : C_0([0,\kappa], \Omega) \to \mathbf{R}$.

Since all our considerations are coupled to the fixed moment of (quantum) time $t = \kappa$, we can restrict our considerations to the class of functionals which depend only on $\psi(\kappa)$. So we can choose the space of classical physical variables consisting of functionals of trajectories, $\psi : [0,\kappa] \to \Omega$, of the form $\psi(\cdot) \to f(\psi(\kappa)), f \in \mathcal{V}_{\rm symp}(\Omega)$. We denote this class by the symbol $\mathcal{V}_{\rm symp}(C_0([0,\kappa], \Omega))$.

Thus, finally, we consider the following classical statistical model on phase space consisting of trajectories $\tilde{\Omega}^\kappa = C_0([0,\kappa], \Omega)$:

$$\tilde{M}^\kappa = (S_{G,{\rm symp}}(\tilde{\Omega}^\kappa), \mathcal{V}_{\rm symp}(\tilde{\Omega}^\kappa)).$$

We define the maps T in the same way as in section 3:

$$T : S_{G,{\rm symp}}(\tilde{\Omega}^\kappa) \to \mathcal{D}(\Omega_c), \;\; T(P_D) = D; \quad (23)$$

$$T : \mathcal{V}_{\rm symp}(\tilde{\Omega}^\kappa) \to \mathcal{L}_s(\Omega_c), \;\; T(f) = f''(0)/2. \quad (24)$$

Theorem 2. *The family of classical statistical model* $\tilde{M}^\kappa, \kappa > 0$, *and the pair of maps (23), (24) provide dequantization of the conventional Dirac-von Neumann quantum model* $N_{\rm quant}$.

5 The magnitude of time scaling

To get the small parameter of our model κ, we should choose quantum and prequantum time scales. There are a few different possibilities and we shall discuss one of them. We choose the *atom time*-scale in QM and the *Planck time*-scale in the prequantum classical theory. At the atom scale we consider the "Hartree time":

$$t_q = t_H = \frac{\hbar}{E_H} \tag{25}$$

Here

$$E_H = \frac{\hbar^2}{m_e a_0^2} = m_e c^2 \alpha^2 \approx 4.35974417(75) 10^{-18} J$$

is the Hartree energy, m_e is the electron mass, a_0 is the Bohr radius, and α is the fine structure constant. Hence:

$$t_q = \frac{\hbar}{m_e c^2 \alpha^2} \approx 2.4188884326505(16) \times 10^{-17} s$$

And we have:

$$t_{\rm prq} = t_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^5}} \approx 5.39121(40) \times 10^{-44} s \tag{26}$$

Therefore our time scaling parameter

$$\kappa = \frac{t_{\rm prq}}{t_q} = \frac{t_P}{t_H} = \alpha^2 m_e \sqrt{\frac{G}{c\hbar}} = \alpha^2 \frac{m_e}{m_P}, \tag{27}$$

where

$$m_P = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}} \approx 2.176 \times 10^{-11} gr$$

is the Planck mass. Thus our time-scaling parameter has the magnitude:

$$\kappa \sim 10^{-27}.$$

Under such a choice of the prequantum scale the difference between statistical predictions of PCSFT and QM (given by (22) is of the order 10^{-27}. Thus, if, e.g., the classical physical variable

$$f(\psi) = \frac{1}{2} < A\psi, \psi > + \frac{1}{4} < A\psi, \psi >^2, A \in \mathcal{L}_s,$$

then the difference between the quantum prediction ($< A >_D =$ TrDA) and the PCSFT-prediction should be of the order 10^{-27}. (Of course, under the assumption that the Planck time t_P really provides the correct prequantum time-scale!)

6 Links to general relativity, string theory, cosmology

6.1 Sub-Planckian time

We see that in the PCSFT-framework it is possible to do classical physics on sub-Planckian time scale[7]. We recall that according to a rather common opinion the Planck time is "the ultimate limit to our laws of physics". By this point of view any classical description of physical reality is impossible for the sub-Planckian time. Moreover, there is the opinion that even the notion of time becomes meaningless for $s < t_P$, see, e.g., WikipediA (The free Encyclopedia) for this very popular viewpoint: "However, the Planck time t_P may not be taken as a "quantum of time." Within the framework of the laws of physics as we understand them today, we can neither measure nor discern any difference between the universe at the time it first came into existence and the universe anything less than 1 Planck time later."

In the opposition to this opinion, in our approach stochastic dynamics on the sub-Planckian scale (dynamics with respect to the "prequantum time" s) plays the fundamental role in reproduction of quantum averages.

6.2 Sub-Planckian space

By considering the sub-Planckian time scale we should also consider the sub-Planckian length scale. However, this is not the case in our model.[8]

In fact, by considering phase space $\Omega = Q \times P$, where $Q = P = H$ is the real (separable) Hilbert space, we exclude from the very beginning the physical space $\mathbf{R}^3$ from consideration. Of course, one could choose the representation of H by $L_2(\mathbf{R}^3)$, but we did this sometimes only to couple our model to physics of classical fields. In principle, there are no reasons to introduce the physical space into consideration.

---

[7] The main distinguishing feature of such classical models is the infinite-dimension of phase space.

[8] The conventional interpretation is that the Planck time is the time it would take a photon traveling at the speed of light to cross a distance equal to the Planck length. Our approach, PCSFT, is a purely field model of reality, cf. Einstein [23]. Moreover, we consider fields not as "real waves" on the finite dimensional physical space, but as points of the infinite dimensional space. In PCSFT time is the evolutional parameter not for dynamics in the conventional physical space, but in the infinite dimensional Hilbert space.

This is a good place to discuss the role of physical space represented by $\mathbf{R}^3$ in our model. In PCSFT the *real physical space* is Hilbert space. If we choose the realization

$$H = L_2(\mathbf{R}^3),$$

then we obtain the realization of H as the space of classical fields on $\mathbf{R}^3$. So the *conventional space* $\mathbf{R}^3$ *appears only through this special representation of the Hilbert configuration space.* Dynamics in $\mathbf{R}^3$ in just a shadow of dynamics in the space of fields. However, we can choose other representations of Hilbert configuration space. In this way we shall obtain classical fields defined on other "physical spaces."

We remark that at first sight the situation with development of PCSFT is somewhat reminiscent of the one confronted by Scrödinger in his introduction of his wave equation, which "maps" waves in the configuration space (the idea that in part derives from Hamilton's mechanical-optical analogy that led Hamilton to his version of classical mechanics). However, as is well known, in the specific case considered by Scrödinger, the configuration space and the physical space were both $\mathbf{R}^3$, which coincidence was in part responsible for Scrödinger's hope that his equation describes an actual physical (wave) process in space-time. This hope did not materialize, given that in general the configuration space of physical systems is not $\mathbf{R}^3$. The difficulties of Schrödinger's program quickly led to Born's interpretation of the wave function in terms of probability or, as Scrödinger himself came to call it "expectation catalogue", which view is central in the orthodox or Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics. Even though he had, just as did Einstein, major reservations concerning quantum mechanics as the ultimate theory of quantum phenomena, Scrödinger never went so far as to see any space other than $\mathbf{R}^3$ as real.

The same can be said about Einstein's attempts to go beyond quantum mechanics. His attempts, see, e.g., [23], to create purely field model of physical reality did not induce rejection of the conventional model of physical space. Nevertheless, some of his comments might be interpreted as signs as coming rejection of the conventional model of physical space, see [23]: "Space-time does not claim existence on its own, but only as a structural quality of the field." "The requirement of general covariance takes away from space and time the last remnant of physical objectivity." And the following Einstein's remark is especially important for PCSFT's view to physical space: "There is no such thing as an empty space, i.e., a space without field. Space-time does not claim existence on its own, but only as a structural quality of the field." L. De Broglie in his theory of double solution (the first hidden variable model) emphasized the fundamental role of physical space $\mathbf{R}^3$. Such a viewpoint also was common for adherents of Bohmian mechanics (in any case for D. Bohm and J. Bell). We can conclude that all former models with field-like hidden variables were based on the conventional model of physical space, namely $\mathbf{R}^3$.

On the other hand, string theory does introduce spaces of higher dimensions, although not of infinite dimensions. This approach was one of inspirations for our radical viewpoint to physical space. One could speculate that on scales of quantum gravity and string theory space became infinite dimensional, just as those theories the space has the (finite) dimension higher than three. (In our approach quantum theory is not the ultimate theory. It has its boundaries of applications. Therefore there are no reasons to expect that "quantum gravity" should exist at all. Thus it would be better to speak not about scales of quantum gravity, but simply about the Planck scale for length and time).

Starting with classical statistical mechanics on the infinite dimensional physical space (PCSFT), we first obtain quantum mechanics and then classical statistical mechanics on the finite-dimensional phase space:

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\lim_{\kappa\to 0}\tilde{M}^{\kappa}=\lim_{h\to 0}N^{h}_{\rm quant}==M_{\rm conv.class.}. \tag{28}$$

7 Nonvacuum fluctuations

The asymptotic equality (22) can be written in the following way (since we consider the class of functions with $f(0)=0$) :

$$\lim_{\kappa\to 0}E\Big[\frac{f(W^D_\kappa)-f(0)}{\kappa}\Big]=<T(f)>_{T(P_D)}\equiv\frac{1}{2}{\rm TrDf}''(0). \tag{29}$$

Denote the average (classical!) $Ef(\psi+W^D_\kappa)$ by the symbol $\bar{f}(\kappa,\psi),\psi\in\Omega$. We have:

Proposition 1. *The quantum average can be represented as the derivative (at the vacuum point $\psi=0$) of the classical average $\bar{f}(\kappa,\psi)$ at $\kappa=0$:*

$$\frac{\partial\bar{f}}{\partial\kappa}(0,0)=<T(f)>_{T(P_D)}\ . \tag{30}$$

We pay attention that

$$\mathcal{U}(g)(\psi) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{TrDg}''(\psi) \tag{31}$$

is the infinitesimal generator of the Wiener process W_t^D, and the function $\bar{f}(t,\psi) = Ef(\psi + W_t^D)$ is the solution of the Cauchy problem:

$$\frac{\partial \bar{f}}{\partial t}(t,\psi) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{TrD}\ \bar{\mathrm{f}}''(\mathrm{t},\psi), \tag{32}$$

$$\bar{f}(0,\psi) = f(\psi) \tag{33}$$

In the same way as we considered fluctuations of the vacuum field: $\psi_{\mathrm{vacuum}} + W_t^D(\omega) \equiv W_t^D(\omega)$, we can consider fluctuations of any field $\psi_0 \in \Omega : \psi_0 + W_t^D(\omega)$. From the purely mathematical viewpoint, there is no difference between such models. Since the differential operator $\mathcal{U}$ given by (31) is the infinitesimal generator, we have the analogue of the asymptotic expansion for any $\psi_0 \in \Omega$:

$$Ef_\kappa(\psi_0 + W_\kappa^D) = \frac{1}{2}E(f''(\psi_0)w_1^D, w_1^D) + O(\kappa), \kappa \to 0, \tag{34}$$

for any f such that $f_{\psi_0}(\psi) \equiv f(\psi - \psi_0) \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{symp}}(\Omega)$. Denote by $P_{\psi_0,D}$ the Wiener measure on the space of trajectories $C_{\psi_0}([0,\kappa],\Omega)$ corresponding to the process $\psi_0 + W_t^D$. Here the space $C_{\psi_0}([0,\kappa],\Omega)$ consists of all continuous trajectories $\psi : [0,\kappa] \to \Omega, \psi(0) = \psi_0$. Denote the space of such Wiener measures by the symbol $S_{G,\mathrm{symp}}(\tilde{\Omega}_{\psi_0}^\kappa)$, where $\tilde{\Omega}_{\psi_0}^\kappa = C_{\psi_0}([0,\kappa],\Omega)$.

We consider the classical statistical model corresponding to the choice of ψ_0 as a (deterministic) background field:

$$\tilde{M}_{\psi_0}^\kappa = (S_{G,\mathrm{symp}}(\tilde{\Omega}_{\psi_0}^\kappa), \mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{symp}}(\tilde{\Omega}_{\psi_0}^\kappa)).$$

Since, for any $f \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{symp}}(\tilde{\Omega}_{\psi_0}^\kappa)$,

$$< f >_{P_{\psi_0,D}} = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}_{\psi_0}^\kappa} f(\psi) dP_{\psi_0,D}(\psi) = Ef(\psi_0 + W_\kappa^D),$$

by (34) we have

$$< f_\kappa >_{P_{\psi_0,D}} = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{TrDf}''(\psi_0) + \mathrm{O}(\kappa), \kappa \to 0. \tag{35}$$

We modify the T-maps for classical statistical states and variables:

$$T : S_{G,\mathrm{symp}}(\tilde{\Omega}^{\kappa}_{\psi_0}) \to \mathcal{D}(\Omega_c),\ \ T(P_{\psi_0,D}) = D; \tag{36}$$

$$T : \mathcal{V}_{\mathrm{symp}}(\tilde{\Omega}^{\kappa}_{\psi_0}) \to \mathcal{L}_s(\Omega_c),\ \ T(f) = f''(\psi_0)/2. \tag{37}$$

Theorem 3. *For any* $\psi_0 \in \Omega$, *the classical statistical model* $\tilde{M}^{\kappa}_{\psi_0}$ *and the pair of maps (36), (37) provide dequantization of the conventional Dirac-von Neumann quantum model* N_{quant}.

If we consider a function $f : \Omega \to \mathbf{R}$ such that $f(\psi_0) \neq 0$, then (35) is modified into

$$\frac{\bar{f}(\kappa, \psi_0) - f(\psi_0)}{\kappa} = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{TrD}\ \bar{\mathrm{f}}''(\psi_0) + \mathrm{O}(\kappa), \kappa \to 0, \tag{38}$$

or

$$\frac{\partial \bar{f}(0, \psi_0)}{\partial \kappa} = \mathcal{U}(\bar{f})(\psi_0) \equiv \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{TrD}\ \bar{\mathrm{f}}''(\psi_0). \tag{39}$$

Thus we found that the operator of quantum averaging $f \to \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{TrDf}''(\psi_0)$ is nothing else than the infinitesimal generator of the prequantum Wiener process.

Remark. (Why the vacuum background?) As we have seen the same quantum model can be derived starting with fluctuations of any background field ψ_0. The quantum model applied in physics only for $\psi_0 = 0$, because effects of small magnitudes could not be extracted in the presence of a nontrivial background field ψ_0.

8 Appendix: no-go theorems, PCSFT and nonlocality

8.1 Comparing with no-go theorems of von Neumann, Cohen-Specker and Bell

The referee of this paper made the following remark on PCST: “The author attempts to derive quantum mechanics from a classical phase space which is infinite dimensional. If this is a correct theory it seems to imply that quantum mechanics should be derivable from classical physics in the limit of an infinite number of particles. A classical system of N non-relativistic particles moving in 3-dimensional Euclidean space has a phase space which is $\mathbf{R}^{6N}$. As $N \to \infty$ this would seem to agree with the author's starting point. If this is the case then quantum mechanics would be derivable from classical fluid dynamics and I do not believe that this is possible." The crucial problem in such a discussion is interpreting the word *"derive."* In fact, we do not claim that QM can be reproduced as a part of classical phase space mechanics. We study possibilities to *map* the classical phase space mechanics onto QM. As we have seen, our classical→ quantum mapping is a rather special – in particular, it is not one-to-one,- but, nevertheless, there is an asymptotic correspondence bewteen classical and quantum averages.

However, there are no-go theorems for mathematical attempts to have a map from classical variables to quantum operators which preserves statistics, e.g., theorems of von Neumann, Cohen-Specker and Bell. The no-go theorems say: No such map exists. In this paper we constructed such a map. What goes?

Our construction does not contradict to known no-go theorems, since our map T does not satisfy some conditions of those theorems. An important condition in all such theorems is that the *range of values* of a classical variable f should coincide with the spectrum of the corresponding quantum operator $T(f)$ – "the range of values postulate." This postulate is violated in our framework. As we have seen, the classical spin variables are continuous and the quantum spin operators have discrete spectrum. Nevertheless, classical averages can be approximated by quantum. Our prequantum classical statistical model is not about observations, but about ontic reality (reality as it is when nobody looks at it).

Henry Stapp pointed out [24]: "The problem, basically, is that to apply quantum theory, one must divide the fundamentally undefined physical world into two idealized parts, the observed and observing system, but *the theory gives no adequate description of connection between these two parts.* The probability function is a function of degrees of freedom of the microscopic observed system, whereas the probabilities it defines are probabilities of responses of macroscopic measuring devices, and these responses are described in terms of quite different degrees of freedom." Since we do know yet from physics so much about features of classical → quantum correspondence map T, we have the freedom to change some conditions which were postulated in the known no-go theorems – for example, the range of values condition. Rejection of this assumption is quite natural, since, as was pointed by Stapp, a classical variable f and its quantum counterpart $T(f)$ depend on completely different degrees of freedom.

8.2 Is prequantum classical statistical field theory nonlocal?

As we have seen, PCSFT does not contradict to the known no-go theorems, in particular, to Bell's theorem. Therefore this theory might be local. However, it is not easy to formulate the problem of locality/nonlocality in the PCSTF-framework. It is not about observations. Thus we could not apply Bell's approach to locality as locality of observations. On the other hand, on the ontic level PCSTF operates not with particles, but with fields. At the first sight, such a theory is nonlocal by its definition, since fields are not localized. But in field theory there was established a different viewpoint to locality and we know that both classical and quantum field theories are local. To formulate the problem of locality for PCSTF, we should proceed in the same way. Therefore we should develop a relativistic version of PCSTF. There are some technical and even ideological problems. As we know, relativistic quantum mechanics is not a well established theory (at least this is a rather common opinion). Thus it is meaningless to develop a relativistic variant of PCSTF which would reproduce relativistic quantum mechanics. The most natural way of development is to construct a kind of PCSTF not for quantum mechanics, but for quantum field theory and study the problem of locality in such a framework. It is an interesting and complicated problem which will be studied in coming papers of the author.

8.3 Classical statistical model for QFT

The scheme (4), (5) is not the final scheme of descriptions of physical reality.

It is well known that deformation quantization can be performed not only on the finite dimensional, but even on infinite dimensional phase space – so called *second quantization,* see e.g. [20] (directly in the case of superfields). In this way one finds the correspondence principle between quantum field theory and classical field theory, see [20] for the rigorous mathematical formulation of this principle. We again use the Planck constant as a small parameter.

On the other hand, in [21] we performed dequantization of quantum field theory. The corresponding classical statistical model is based on functionals of classical fields, $\psi \rightarrow F(\psi)$. Averaging in QFT can be considered as an approximation of classical averaging on the space of field functionals.

Combining dequantization for QFT and the correspondence principle for second quantization, we obtain the following scheme of descriptions of physical reality:

$$\text{Theory of functionals of classical fields} \rightarrow \text{Quantum field theory} \tag{40}$$

$$\rightarrow \text{Classical field theory} \tag{41}$$

The crucial point is that the time scales for classical field theory in two schemes (4), (5) and (40), (41) are different. In the first one we consider the quick time scale:

$$\text{Classical field theory}_{\text{quick time}} \rightarrow \text{Quantum mechanics} \tag{42}$$

$$\rightarrow \text{Mechanics of classical particles} \tag{43}$$

In the second one we consider the slow time scale:

$$\text{Theory of functionals of classical fields} \rightarrow \text{Quantum field theory} \tag{44}$$

$$\rightarrow \text{Classical field theory}_{\text{slow time}} \tag{45}$$

In principle we can proceed as long as we like. In [22] I proposed so called *third quantization,* deformation quantization for functionals of classical fields. In this way one can construct quantum theory of functionals of classical fields. This theory also can be dequantized and so on.

Conclusion. *We developed consistently the viewpoint on QM as an approximative theory*[9] *for calculation of averages with respect to classical random fields. The parameter of the asymptotic expansion for classical averages is determined by two time scales, the quantum time scale (the atomic time scale in our terminology) and the prequantum time scale (the Planck time scale in this paper).*[10] *The first one is a*

---

[9] Cf. with the approach based on the nonlinear Schrödinger equation [25]–[28]; see [29], [30] for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the PCSFT-framework.

[10] This paper was strongly motivated by the paper of G. F.R. Ellis and T. Buchert [31] on the role of scaling in general relativity and cosmology. We start with some citations from this paper: "Any mathematical description of a physical system depends on an *averaging scale* characterizing the nature of the envisaged model. This averaging scale

slow time scale and the second one is a quick time scale. We presented a classical model, PCSFT, which gives the possibility to go beyond QM and beyond the Planck time scale.

I would like to thank Börje Nilsson for numerous discussions on scale-analysis in classical and quantum physics and G. ‘t Hooft and A. Leggett for discussions on possibilities to go beyond QM.

References

[1] Khrennikov A. Yu., Prequantum classical statistical model with infinite dimensional phase-space, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, **38**, 9051-9073 (2005); Generalizations of Quantum Mechanics Induced by Classical Statistical Field Theory. *Found. Phys. Letters*, **18**, 637-650 (2005).

[2] De la Pena L. and Cetto A. M., *The Quantum Dice: An Introduction to Stochastic Electrodynamics* (Kluwer, Dordrecht) 1996.

[3] Boyer T. H., *A Brief Survey of Stochastic Electrodynamics* in Foundations of Radiation Theory and Quantum Electrodynamics, edited by Barut A. O. (Plenum, New York) 1980; Boyer T. H., Timothy H., *Scientific American*, pp. 70-78, Aug 1985; see also an extended discussion on vacuum fluctuations in: M. Scully O., Zubairy M. S., *Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) 1997; Louisell W. H., *Quantum Statistical Properties of Radiation* (J. Wiley, New York) 1973; Mandel L. and Wolf E., *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) 1995.

[4] Cavalleri G., *Nuovo Cimento* B, **112** (1997) 1193.

[5] Zecca A. and Cavalleri G., *Nuovo Cimento* B, **112**, (1997) 1.

[6] Cavalleri G. and Tonni E., "Discriminating between QM and SED with spin", in C. Carola and A. Rossi, *The Foundations of Quantum Mechanics (Hystorical Analysis and Open Questions)* (World Sceintific Publ., Singapore), p.111, 2000.

[7] Nelson E., Quantum fluctuation, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1985.

[8] Davidson M., J. Math. Phys. 20 (1979) 1865; Physica A 96 (1979) 465.

---

is usually hidden from view: it is taken to be understood." "A large scale smoothed-out model of the universe ignores small scale inhomogeneities, but the averaging effects of those inhomogeneities may alter both observational and dynamical relations at the larger scale." In our approach we discuss "forbidden scaling", namely scaling beyond the Planck time. Moreover, we claim that QM can be considered as "a large scale smoothed-out model of the universe" which ignores small (prequantum) scale fluctuations.

[9] Casado A., Fernandez-Rueda A., Marshall T., Risco-Delgado R., Santos E., *Phys. Rev.* A, **55** (1997) 3879.

[10] Casado A., Marshall T., Santos E., *J. Opt. Soc. Am.* B, **14** (1997) 494.

[11] Brida G., Genovese M., Gramegna M., Novero C., and Predazzi E., *Phys. Lett* A, **299** (2002) 121.

[12] Hiley B., Phase space distribution of quantum phenomena. In *Quantum Theory: Reconsideration of Foundations-2,* Ser. Math. Modeling, vol. 10, Växjö University Press, Växjö, 2003, pp. 267–299.

[13] Khrennikov A. Yu., Annalen der Physik 12 (2003) 575; J. Phys.A: Math. Gen. 34 (2001) 9965; Il Nuovo Cimento B 117 (2002) 267; J. Math. Phys. 43 (2002) 789; Ibid 45 (2004) 902; Doklady Mathematics 71 (2005) 363.

[14] Ballentine L. E., *Quantum mechanics* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey) 1989.

[15] Beltrametti E. G., *The Logic of Quantum Mechanics* (Addison-Wesley) 1981.

[16] De Muynck W. M., *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics, an Empiricists Approach* (Kluwer, Dordrecht) 2002.

[17] Accardi L., *Urne e Camaleoni: Dialogo sulla realta, le leggi del caso e la teoria quantistica* (Il Saggiatore, Rome) 1997.

[18] Accardi L., Gang Lu Yun, Volovich I., *Quantum Theory and Its Stochastic Limit* (Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg) 2006.

[19] Genovese M., *Phys. Rep.*, **413** (2005) 319.

[20] Khrennikov A.Yu., *Supernalysis* (Nauka, Fizmatlit, Moscow, 1997, in Russian; English translation: Kluwer, Dordreht, 1999);

[21] A. Yu. Khrennikov, On the problem of hidden variables for quantum field theory, *Nuovo Cimento* B, **121** (2006) 505.

[22] Khrennikov A.Yu., Infinite-dimensional pseudo-differential operators, *Izvestiya Akademii Nauk USSR, ser.Math.*, **51** (1987) 46.

[23] Einstein A., *The collected papers of Albert Einstein,* Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1993.

[24] Stapp H. P., S-matrix interpretation of quantum theory, *Phys. Rev.* D. **3** (1971) 1303.

[25] Bialynicki-Birula I. and Mycielski J., *Annals of Physics*, **100** (1976) 62.

[26] Shimony A., *Phys. Rev.*, A **20** (1979) 394.

[27] Shull C. G., Atwood D. K., Arthur J., and Horne M. A, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **44** (1980) 765; Weinberg S., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **62** (1989) 485; Gisin N., *Hel. Physica Acta*, **62** (1989) 363.

[28] Doebner H. D., *Non-linear partial differential operators and quantization* (Berlin, Springer-Verlag, 1983).

[29] Khrennikov A. Yu., Prequantum classical statistical field theory: Complex representation, Hamilton-Schrödinger equation, and interpretation of stationary states, *Found. Phys. Lett.*, **19** (2006) 299.

[30] Khrennikov A. Yu., Nonlinear Schrödinger equations from prequantum classical statistical field theory, *Physics Letters A*, **357** (2006) 171.

[31] Ellis G. F.R. and Buchert T., The universe seen at different scales, *Phys. Lett.*, A **347** (2005) 38.